## United States District Court

## Eastern District of Missouri

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

V.

## ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

KEITH COSTELLO, III	Case Number: 4:05CR00449 CAS (AGF)
	==== (INI)
detention of the defendant pending trial in this case.	2(f) a detention hearing has been held. I conclude that the following facts require the
(I) The defendant is charged with an offense describlocal offense that would have been a federal offense a crime of violence as defined in 18 U.S.C. an offense for which the maximum sentence.	
18 U.S.C. §3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or comparable (2) The offense described in finding (1) was commit offense.  (3) A period of not more than five years has elapsed soffense described in finding (1).  (4) Findings Nos. (1), (2) and (3) establish a rebuttata assure the safety of (an)other person(s) and the comparable (2).	ince the (date of conviction) (release of the defendant from imprisonment) for the ble presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably community. I further find that the defendant has not rebutted this presumption.
Al  (1) There is probable cause to believe that the defend	Iternative Findings (A)
	ent of ten years or more is prescribed in
under 18 U.S.C. §924(c).	n established by finding 1 that no condition or combination of conditions will
A	Iternative Findings (B)
(1) There is a serious risk that the defendant will not	t appear.
Neither party had any objections to the Pretr that any threats or statements were made at t	langer the safety of another person or the community. ial Services Report (PSR) dated August 15, 2005, except Defendant denies he time of his arrest and further states that he and his girlfriend continue to at, the PSR does not suggest otherwise). Subject to the foregoing s the PSR.
Part II - Written  find that the credible testimony and information submittee  a preponderance of the evidence	
	ll adequately assure Defendant's appearance and the safety of the
	easons stated by the Court at the hearing. Based upon the testimony at the
	ed his girlfriend with a loaded firearm on March 4, 2005 prior to his arrest, ment where he was staying upon the arrival of the police, and that he made
	s arrest. As further set forth in the PSR, Defendant committed the offense
	following Defendant's release on bond for the state charges arising out of
	basis for the instant federal charges, Defendant was arrested, on June 28,
The defendant is committed to the custody of the Atto facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons as fendant shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private	Directions Regarding Detention rney General or his designated representative for confinement in a corrections waiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The de- te consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or charge of the corrections facility shall deliver the defendant to the United States th a court proceeding.
Dated: August 16, 2005	/s/ Audrey G. Fleissig
	Signature of Judicial Officer
	Audrey G. Fleissig, United States Magistrate Judge  Name and Title of Judicial Officer

<sup>\*</sup>Insert as applicable: (a) Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 5801 et seq.); (b) Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. §951 et seq.); or (c) Section I of Act of Sept. 15, 1980 (21 U.S.C. §955a).

	Page Of
DEFENDANT: KEITH COSTELLO, III	
CASE NUMBER: 4:05CR00449 CAS (AGF)	

AO 472 (Rev. 3/86) Order of Detention Pending Trial

## Continued

2005, on new charges including murder 1st degree, robbery 1st degree, armed criminal action, and property damage. Further, Defendant has no substantial work history, no permanent residence, and a history of failing to appear for court, and he is now facing charges that carry a substantial penalty, which could provide an incentive for flight.

Defendant has suggested that he be released on a \$10,000 bond, secured by 10%, but the Court finds, for the foregoing reasons, that Defendant has not rebutted the presumption that arises that there is no condition or combination of conditions that will adequately assure Defendant's appearance and the safety of the community.

Counsel for Defendant noted at the hearing that she had not yet been able to contact witnesses who could potentially provide testimony relevant to the events of March 4, 2005. In the event Defendant hereafter develops information that could provide a basis to reconsider this Court's order, Defendant may file a motion for reconsideration at that time.